

Amend claims 1, 10, and 21 as follows:

1. A method for reducing contamination inside a plastic container, comprising coating selected portions of the container with a coating that consists essentially of titanium dioxide such that the titanium dioxide is not substantially prevented from attracting atmospheric water molecules for loosening particle contamination, for facilitating cleaning the container to prevent contamination of the article when the article is stored in the container, and using the container for holding at least one semiconductor wafer.

10. An apparatus for reducing contamination of an article, comprising a plastic container adapted for holding the article, and a coating on selected portions of said container, said coating consisting essentially of titanium dioxide such that the titanium dioxide is not substantially prevented from attracting atmospheric water molecules for loosening particle contamination, for facilitating cleaning the container to prevent contamination of the article when the article is stored in the container, the apparatus further comprising at least one semiconductor wafer disposed in the container.

21. The method of claim [20] 1, further comprising providing said coating in the form of a gel.

Add new claims 26 and 27 as follows:

26. The method of claim 1, wherein said selected portions are interior surfaces of the container.

27. The apparatus of claim 1, wherein said coating is provided in the form of a gel.

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed July 9, 2003. Applicant thanks the examiner for reconsidering the finality of the rejections. Claims 2, 5 - 9, 15 - 20, and 22 - 25 have been cancelled, without prejudice. Method claims 1, 3, 4, 14, 21 remain along with new claim 26, and apparatus claims 10 - 13 remain along with new claim 27.

Restriction Requirement

Claims as Originally Filed

Applicant made an election of claims in response to the restriction requirement with traverse. A detailed presentation of the reasons for traverse has been given and is repeated briefly here.

Originally filed method claims 1 - 9 were alleged to be non-distinct from originally filed apparatus claims 10 - 13. The basis for the restriction requirement was MPEP 806.05(e). MPEP 806.05(e) pertains to **“PROCESS AND APPARATUS FOR ITS PRACTICE.”**